

# Freedom Of The Press

## THE BUSINESS OF THE N. Y. JOURNALIST

John Swinton, editor of the New York Tribune, to the New York Press Assn. on Feb. 26, 1936 stated:

"There is no such thing as an independent press in America, unless it is in the country towns. You know it, and I know it."

"There is not one of you who dares express an honest opinion. If you express an honest opinion, you know beforehand, it would never appear in print."

"I am paid \$150.00 a week for keeping my honest opinion out of the paper I am connected with. Others of you are paid similar salaries for doing similar things. If I should permit honest opinions to be printed in one issue of my paper, like Othello, before twenty-four hours, my occupation would be gone."

"The business of the New York journalists is to destroy the truth, to lie outright, to pervert, to vilify, to fawn at the feet of Mammon; to sell his race and his country for his daily bread."

"We are tools and vessels of rich men behind the scenes."

"We are intellectual prostitutes."

This vital and sacred element in U.S., is in ever-lasting danger—since the Kennedy Family took over in Washington. There is extensive freedom of the press, where it aids the so-called Kennedy Administration, which is directed by Jews in all key spots—such as policy-making, both domestic and foreign. (We are waiting for some reputable person to challenge us on this).

On Monday August 13th, Jack Kennedy demonstrated his ideas of freedom. For days ahead it had been ballyhooed that he was going to have an important announcement on every TV and Radio hook-up in the U.S., about a tax cut. It turned out to be 90% campaign propaganda, and the same statement he had made several times before: a tax cut in January, 1963. He said timing was of the essence, and we agree.

In the coming November election, the gullible voter will be told he better elect certain candidates if he wants a tax cut. Kennedy will need these "YES" men candidates because the present session of Congress has given Kennedy the most severe rebuke, as far as legislation is concerned, ever suffered by any president in history.

The Kennedys have been ruthless in suppressing unfavorable news. Walter Winchell, on TV station KFBM in San Diego, stated that the Kennedys threatened the Hearst papers with a suit regarding a merger in California, unless they stopped their writers from criticizing the Kennedys. Winchell said this was after Wm. Randolph Hearst, Jr., had a one hour and twenty minute meeting with President Kennedy, at which he was told by the President to go see his kid brother, not the Attorney General of the United States, but 'my kid brother.' According to Winchell, Robert Kennedy then gave the ultimatum.

Winchell also says that some one in the Department of Justice told Henry Luce, editor of Time and Life: "You have five TV Stations, haven't you, Mr. Luce? Go ahead and start something!" Other writers have been called into the White House to receive a calling down for writing unfavorable articles.

Westbrook Pegler, with Hearst publications for eighteen years, has broken with Hearst papers, and his contract has been cancelled. Pegler stated: "Much of our daily press is now under coercion, snarling and menacing. I had a recent alarming exper-



Westbrook Pegler

ience in the Hearst organization. I received insolent, arrogant warnings from King Features (a subsidiary of Hearst) that nothing unfavorable to the Kennedy administration or offensive to any member of the Kennedy family, will be allowed out of New York, where the censors sit." During 1962, twelve complete columns of Peglers were killed by King Features so that the 140 newspapers did not receive them.

Ninety-nine percent of the newspapers are organized to make money and so must walk a tight wire as far as facts are concerned. To incur the ill will of the advertisers will close them up. They dared not print the truth, before or after World War II. They dare not print the truth about the Marxist power in Washington now.

Newspapers dare not tell the facts about a thousand vital questions, concerning which the public are hungry for answers. That's where Common Sense comes in, but we need the cooperation of alert citizens to build a stronger, more frequent publication.

## World Government Planners

—o— Continued from page 1 —o—

to create the left-leaning governments that Khrushchev will need to give him assured control of the new ruling body.

People keep wondering why, for instance, we are throttling courageous little anti-communist Greece while we fatten up communist Yugoslavia, our foresworn enemy. It does not make sense to many that we are cutting down in assistance to Free China while we worked affirmatively to bring Soviet Outer Mongolia into the U.N. Many still cannot understand why we pressured Nosavan in Laos to give Khrushchev his Troika Government in that little country that is the hub of Southeast Asia.

During this past week we exerted our influence to give Khrushchev's front runner in Indonesia, Sukarno, a complete victory in Dutch New Guinea. We are moving for economic sanctions or worse against Moise Tshombe who is holding out against the Troika government we are forcing on the Congolese people. We are denigrating the leaders of Spain, of West Germany, of Portugal, we conspicuously deny an opportunity to the head of beleaguered Guatemala to visit this country while we prostrate ourselves in welcoming the pro-Soviet dictator of Ghana. We seem to be knocking down all of Khrushchev's enemies for him.

This makes sense only on the theory that we are making the prospect of merger more palatable to Khrushchev.

But meanwhile the American people are being brainwashed by our planners that

communism is "mellowing." We are told that it is no longer a threat because it is not "monolithic" but "polycentric." When you analyse the evidence you find that most of it comes from communist handouts, and independent checks show communism more integrated than ever before—and more intransigent.

I find this issue—the eclipse of our heritage through merger with our enemies—so predominant over all others that it calls for the ultimate in emphasis. People must be told what the planners are up to. I am sure that if they knew, their reactions would be wholesome and effective.

(End of Quotation.)

If you ask the Planners why they must make new concessions at every new meeting at every new international bargaining table, they will doubtless come out with that stock

"It is better to bargain than to risk the threat of all-out nuclear war."

Suppose we concede—for the sake of argument—that we may be dead if we don't go Red; just how serious is the situation? We like the answer sent by Constantine Brown from Rome, because he uses their (the Planners') figures for his report:

The estimate of some of President Kennedy's advisers that 8 million Americans would die in a nuclear war means that our chance of survival would be a little more than 1 out of 2. The early Virginia settlers who came to America had a survival ratio far less than that.

Only 1 out of 10 survived the first 3 years in America. When the Mayflower touched our shores in 1620, the passengers had better luck. Fifty of the 100 aboard survived the first year.

But this ratio did not frighten the settlers whose desire for freedom was greater than their love of life. Between 1630 and 1640 some 20,000 of them dared to come to the land of the free.

And life for these courageous people was difficult. In a report of food scarcity, Isaac Backus later wrote, "Quoth one, 'My husband has traveled as far as Plymouth . . . and has with great toil brought a little corn home, and, before that is spent, the Lord will assuredly provide.'

But with the full knowledge of the hardships to be endured, the American settlers make their irrevocable decisions. John Winthrop, Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, wrote:

"God hath provided this place to be a refuge for many whom He means to save out of the general calamity, and seeing the church hath no place left to fly but into the wilderness, what better work can there be, than to go?"

Can the courage of these men and women, centuries dead, to make fateful decisions inspire us today? Dare we decide to fight for our Nation if need be? Have we the wisdom to make the best decision with faith that God will save many "out of this general calamity"?

(End of Quotation.)

Of course, the Planners who now make the decisions in our name, have long ceased to make any decisions in God's Name. He is ruled out of the council halls of the mighty; His name in a gathering of children in a publicly owned building such as a New York schoolhouse. And it is nothing short of anti-social bigotry to mention the Name of His only begotten Son in a mixed gathering.

How can we have the courage of our fathers if we have turned our backs on the God of our fathers?

## ECONOMIC MERGER, TOO

While the Planners are taking all the necessary steps to effect political and military merger with our enemies; even more frantic is their desire to complete economic